

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/718,059	THOMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lawrence Shrader	2124	

All Participants:

(1) Lawrence Shrader.

(2) Robert Blaha, Reg. No. 43,502.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 August 2004

Time: 9:30 AM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 8, and 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The independent claims 1 (computer), 8 (method), and 13 (program) had a 35 USC § 101 problem lacking usefulness. It was suggested that the Applicant consider moving claims 2 and 3 into claim 1 (and corresponding changes in claims 8 and 13) in order to provide useful steps in the case wherein a spare slot was found (claim 2), and also for the case wherein a spare slot was not found (claim 3). Mr. Blaha agreed to send a proposed amendment via e-mail to be incorporated as an examiner's amendment.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY